

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/730,117	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MAKISHIMA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> RICHARD M. BEMBEN	<b>Art Unit</b> 2622	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) RICHARD M. BEMBEN.

(2) Paul T. Sewell (Reg. No. 61,784).

**Date of Interview:** 16 February 2010

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

  

Claims discussed:

*1, 6, 9 as numbered in the RCE filed 11 January 2010.*

Prior art documents discussed:

  

**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** 30

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** 11AM EST

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: There were actually two interviews spanning the time period of 28 January 2010 (examiner's initial contact) - 16 February 2010 (issues resolved). The first interview (agreement reached 2 February 2010) dealt with claims 1, 6, and 9 (as numbered in the RCE filed 11 January 2010). Claims 1 and 9 were amended to include the "to be printed" claim requirement and claim 6 was canceled due to redundancy with claim 1. The second interview (agreement reached 16 February 2010) dealt with claim 9. Claim 9 was amended to include the "when they are displayed at the same time on said display" claim requirement. Claim 9 was also amended to require the "digital image data" amendments to ensure antecedent basis throughout the claim. See the accompanying Allowance.